

**CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT**

ENDC/FV.289
28 February 1967
ENGLISH

THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

SEP 6 1967

DOCUMENT
COLLECTION

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-NINTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 28 February 1967, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. W.C. FOSTER

(United States of America)

GE.67-3346

67-06412

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. A.F. AZEREDO da SILVEIRA
Mr. D. SILVEIRA da MOTA
Mr. A. da COSTA GUIMARAES
Mr. S. de QUEIROZ DUARTE

Bulgaria:

Mr. K. CHRISTOV
Mr. B. KONSTANTINOV
Mr. T. DAMIANOV
Mr. D. KOSTOV

Burma

U KYAW MIN

Canada

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS
Mr. S.F. RAE
Mr. C.J. WEBSTER
Mr. C.J. MARSHALL

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. P. WINKLER
Mr. T. IAHODA
Mr. V. VAJNAR

Ethiopia:

Dejazmatch A. ABERRA
Mr. A. ZELIEKE
Mr. B. ASSFAW

India:

Mr. V.C. TRIVEDI
Mr. K.P. JAIN

Italy:

Mr. F. CAVALLETTI
Mr. G.P. TOZZOLI
Mr. E. FRANCO
Mr. F. SORO

Mexico:

Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES
Mr. M. TELLO MACIAS

Nigeria:

Alhaji SULE KOLO

Mr. B.O. TONWE

Poland:

Mr. M. BLUSZTAJN

Mr. J. GOIDBIAT

Mr. E. STANIEWSKI

Romania:

Mr. N. ECOBESCO

Mr. O. IONESCO

Mr. C. UNGUREANU

Mr. A. COROIANU

Sweden:

Mrs. A. MYRDAL

Mr. A. EDELSTAM

Mr. H. BLIX

Mr. R. BOMAN

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN

Mr. G.A. KISELEV

Mr. I.I. CHEPROV

Mr. V.B. TOULINOV

United Arab Republic:

Mr. H. KHALIAF

Mr. A. OSMAN

Mr. A.A. SALAM

Mr. M. SHAKER

United Kingdom:

Lord CHALFONT

Mr. B.J. GARNETT

Mr. P.W.J. BUXTON

Mr. R.I.T. CROMARTIE

United States of America:

Mr. W.C. FOSTER

Mr. S. DE PALMA

Mr. G. BUNN

Mr. C.G. BREAN

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. D. PROTITCH

Deputy Special Representative
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

1. The CHAIRMAN (United States of America): I declare open the 289th plenary meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.
2. Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): Our Committee has begun its eleventh session. We have ahead of us a long period of work which we hope will be fruitful. The reconvening of our Conference as planned, the interesting messages sent to the Committee by the Secretary-General of the United Nations (ENDC/PV.287, para. 4), the President of the United States (ENDC/187) and the British Prime Minister (ENDC/188), the experience we have gained at preceding sessions and the presence here of eminent persons and highly-qualified experts are genuine guarantees for the success of our future work.
3. In accordance with our practice, our session is beginning with a general debate, and in that context the Italian delegation would like today to submit certain comments to the Committee.
4. Our negotiations are resuming at a time when the international situation is not without its anxieties but also shows some reassuring aspects. The causes for anxiety are known; but we should not undervalue a number of factors favourable to our negotiations. The keen desire of the peoples for peace and their firm belief in the need for disarmament remain alive and active. At the twenty-first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations the representatives of the very great majority of the countries of the world, with the authority invested in them, once more formally reaffirmed their faith in those ideals. The deliberations at the United Nations were followed by practical results. One of these is the conclusion of the Treaty on the Demilitarization of Outer Space (A/RES/2222(XXI)). That Treaty is an event of notable significance. It shows that disarmament agreements are quite possible at the present time and that the desire for rapprochement between peoples is prevailing over mistrust and crises.
5. Furthermore, the countries of Latin America have brought their important work rapidly to a successful conclusion: they have drafted a Treaty for the denuclearization of their continent (ENDC/186). This is the embodiment of an idea which reflects great credit on its sponsors and those who have put it into effect. It is also an extremely useful and inspiring example to us. I should like to express my warmest congratulations to Ambassador Garcia Robles, who played such an important part in the conclusion of the Treaty.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

6. These events -- the conclusion of these two Treaties -- may be viewed against a general background of improvement in international collaboration, particularly between East and West. Numerous high-level visits -- among which I should like to mention President Podgorny's recent visit to my country -- have taken place of late. Those exchanges of views have drawn us closer together. The frank and friendly discussions between those statesmen have created better understanding and encouraged mutual confidence. In the same way a spirit of greater confidence could expedite our negotiations and lead to more practical results.
7. Our objectives remain the same: I do not think anything should be changed on our agenda. Naturally, our Committee cannot neglect the work of drafting a treaty on general and complete disarmament. General and complete disarmament is a permanent political programme that is common to us and unites us all. No one can abandon the prospect, however distant, of creating a new and better world. Such an undertaking has value both in itself and in relation to the disarmament measures which must be achieved gradually, stage by stage.
8. We must therefore conclude specific, balanced and controlled agreements leading gradually to ever wider understanding and to general disarmament. Thus the various proposals for collateral measures, in particular those relating to the freeze, remain valid as a start to that process and are rightly included in our agenda. Non-proliferation, the halting of underground nuclear tests, the cut-off and the freeze of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles are measures that we have debated a long time, making some progress and clarifying problems and positions.
9. At our meeting last Thursday the Swedish delegation asked that the Committee should resume its study of all those questions in parallel without neglecting any of them (ENDC/PV.288, para. 33). That method appears to conform both to the resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly and to the needs of our work.
10. For all the subjects I have mentioned -- non-proliferation, the cut-off, the halting of nuclear tests and the freeze of delivery vehicles -- the ground has been thoroughly prepared, so that I do not believe it venturesome to hope that some agreements can be concluded. Of all these problems, that of non-proliferation has been the subject of especially extensive and detailed work.
11. We are familiar with the history of the long and, so far, disappointing negotiation on non-proliferation. Two draft non-proliferation treaties have been submitted here (ENDC/152 and Add.1; ENDC/164). This Committee has tried indefatigably to bring

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

them together. Numerous aspects of the problem, such as nuclear sharing within alliances, the European clause, the balance of commitments and security guarantees, have been examined thoroughly but the differences have not been overcome. At one point, because of the deadlock, the Italian delegation suggested an interim solution: a voluntary nuclear moratorium for a given period (ENDC/157). The eight delegations of non-aligned countries have submitted memoranda (ENDC/158, 178) explaining their joint views.

12. That in brief was the state of the negotiations when our Conference adjourned last August. The months since then have not been wasted in idleness. At the United Nations General Assembly encouraging statements from the Soviet Union and United States representatives gave grounds for optimism. The work of the Assembly which followed was very constructive. Admittedly the Assembly did not -- and indeed could not -- put forward ready-made solutions for the difficulties which once again emerged during its discussions; but it did adopt important resolutions that should make the difficulties easier to overcome. In particular, the resolution (A/RES/2149(XXI)) which, partly taking up the Italian idea of a voluntary moratorium, invites governments to refrain during negotiations from any actions which might delay or hamper the conclusion of a non-proliferation treaty was both a gesture of confidence in this Committee and an omen of success.

13. After the Assembly adjourned, non-proliferation continued to be a subject of intense diplomatic activity. The exchanges of view continued. Negotiation can now enter a new collective phase. The Soviet Union's objections alleging proliferation as a result of the multilateral force project now seem groundless. However, other matters are still before the Conference. It is obvious and has always been stressed that a non-proliferation treaty must not satisfy one or certain Powers only; its scope is world-wide. It should also be so drafted as to be commensurate with the contribution made to it by the countries renouncing nuclear weapons. All points of view must now be studied thoroughly with this aim in mind, and any proposals put forward will have to be examined in the light of these considerations.

14. The Committee should draft without delay a genuine, just and effective non-proliferation treaty which will meet the peoples' desires. An effective and just treaty: the two terms are related. The effectiveness and the equity of the non-proliferation treaty are closely interdependent. The treaty's purpose is to strengthen peace and general security. Its effectiveness will depend upon the scope

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

of the accession to it. In this connexion, the accession of each country may clearly be conditional upon that of other countries, particularly those in the same geographical area.

15. The scope of the accession to the treaty will in its turn depend on the fair balance which its provisions establish between the advantages gained and the sacrifices made by one and all, and between the specific purposes of the treaty and the wider objectives of disarmament both nuclear and conventional. The accession and support the treaty obtains in Europe and the rest of the world will depend on that balance; they will be its consequence and its result. Sacrifices can and must be made for peace; but a non-proliferation treaty which prejudiced the basic political, economic and scientific interests of the participating countries could not have the universal assent that we wish for it.

16. The Italian delegation's open mind and good will have been clearly demonstrated by its untiring activity both here and at the United Nations, and also by a practical proposal for the renunciation of atomic weapons. By that proposal we proclaimed, as always, the advantages and the urgency of restricting the spread of nuclear weapons; and we declared that renunciation by the non-nuclear States should entail a counterpart measure, because non-proliferation was considered not as an end in itself but as a step towards the reduction and eventual abolition of nuclear weapons. The nuclear Powers thus had an incentive to embark upon that course. As far as we are concerned, those principles are equally valid for the preparation of a treaty; and in our opinion they give rise to requirements which the Italian delegation may wish to set forth in detail at a suitable time later in our discussions.

17. Here and now, however, the Italian delegation can affirm that there could be no universal approbation for a non-proliferation treaty that established a perpetual discrimination between two classes of countries. On the contrary the treaty, by halting the danger of the spread of nuclear weapons, must in our opinion be the starting-point for the process of halting the nuclear arms race and of controlling nuclear weapons pending their gradual elimination. In default of those developments an agreement on non-proliferation, even if concluded, would eventually become null and void. The United Kingdom representative, Lord Chalfont, alluded to this problem at our last meeting when he said:

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

(Spoke in English)

"If the arms race between the most powerful States continues, tension and suspicion will certainly continue too. Not even the most light-headed optimist can hope that in these circumstances a non-proliferation treaty can succeed, or a non-proliferation treaty last for any considerable time."

(ENDC/PV.288, para. 8)

(Continued in French)

18. The Italian delegation looks forward to a relationship between non-proliferation and the other disarmament measures in accordance with which a procedure written into the treaty should be used at some stage to verify whether sufficient progress has been made towards the achievement of the treaty's objects. This verification would enable each participant to see whether in fact he could continue to support the treaty.

19. Another problem concerns the obstacles that a non-proliferation treaty might put in the way of peaceful nuclear development in non-nuclear weapon States. In this connexion President Johnson said in his message to the Committee:

(Spoke in English)

"I have instructed our negotiators to exercise the greatest care that the treaty not hinder the non-nuclear powers in their development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes." (ENDC/187)

(Continued in French)

20. We welcome these assurances, which show a deep sense of responsibility. They refer to a subject which we consider absolutely vital to our negotiations and to the future treaty. In this connexion, speaking at our meeting of 5 April 1966, the Italian delegation said: "Furthermore, we must never forget that besides military activities there are peaceful ones which must be safeguarded." (ENDC/PV.255, p. 27) Clearly it would be inadmissible for a non-proliferation treaty, through technical limitations or the unfair influence of discriminatory controls, to delay or hamper scientific, technical or social progress in non-nuclear weapon countries. Each country must remain free to develop its industrial facilities through the use of all forms of atomic energy.

21. In this connexion we note with sympathetic interest the decisions adopted recently by our Latin-American friends in establishing a nuclear-free continent. We even believe that peaceful nuclear co-operation on an organized international basis should gain new impetus and make available to all peoples the advantages secured through science. I hope that we all agree on the need to acknowledge and to meet these

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

requirements. The main problem is thus to find technical treaty language which will do so. It is not an insoluble problem if, as I am convinced, everyone's intentions are sincere.

22. On the problem of controls, the Italian delegation said on 29 March 1966 that all countries, both nuclear and non-nuclear, would have to co-operate in applying safeguards, without discrimination or exception (ENDC/PV.252, p. 15). Our attitude remains the same if these controls are established, as we still believe that, in conformity with our proposal pertaining to a moratorium (ENDG/157), controls can be applied by the International Atomic Energy Agency, or in certain zones by some other equivalent organization.

23. I should like to stress a final point. My delegation has often spoken at this Conference of our aspirations and efforts for the establishment of a united Europe. On this subject the Italian delegation stated on 24 March 1966:

"... a non-proliferation treaty cannot paralyse the aspirations existing in Western Europe ... towards the achievement of a closer association and integration of European countries in all spheres". (ENDC/PV.251, p.11)

These aspirations correspond to basic and unchangeable objectives of my country's policy, as set out in the Treaty of the European communities signed by Italy. Neither in letter nor in spirit should a non-proliferation treaty interfere with the attainment of these aspirations. They menace no one, and their attainment would guarantee European security and a better world balance.

24. This Committee's task is certainly one of great scope and complexity. It aims, in the name of peace and co-operation between peoples, to fulfil the troublesome task of reconciling different interests. If it succeeds, as we hope it will, the non-proliferation treaty will be a truly effective factor in achieving rapprochement and security. It will be the starting-point of a gradual process of general disarmament, and an instrument of permanent co-operation between the peoples for their well-being and progress.

25. We sincerely hope that the joint efforts of all the delegations will succeed in overcoming the remaining difficulties. For its part, the Italian delegation is preparing to participate in the Committee's forthcoming work with renewed and, if possible, increased determination and to contribute all it can to the drafting of the disarmament agreements on our agenda, starting with the general treaty on non-proliferation, in conformity with the ideas I have just set forth. I hope that world peace, confidence and co-operation may emerge strengthened and reaffirmed from the deliberations of this session of the Conference.

26. The CHAIRMAN (United States of America): Before calling on the next speaker, I should like to remedy an oversight at the opening of this meeting when I neglected to call attention to the fact that we have with us today for the first time the distinguished representative of Nigeria, Ambassador Kolo. I should like to welcome Ambassador Kolo to these meetings.

27. Mr. CHRISTOV (Bulgaria) (translated from French): First of all, I should like to express my profound gratitude towards the representatives of the United Arab Republic, the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom for the kind words which they addressed to me at the opening meeting of this session. I also thank all my colleagues for the warm welcome which they extended to me as the new head of the Bulgarian delegation. May I add that it is a great privilege for me to be able to participate once again in the disarmament negotiations in this Committee where so many eminent persons are sitting? I think I may also say that I am very fortunate to have come to Geneva at a time when we may expect that the discussion which has just resumed will lead to concrete results in accordance with the hopes of all men of goodwill.

28. In taking the floor for the first time I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that the Bulgarian delegation will continue, as in the past, to co-operate in the efforts that are being made here to fulfil to the best of our ability the tasks which the United Nations has entrusted to our Committee and to achieve real progress in its disarmament negotiations. In this respect we have followed -- and will continue to follow -- the foreign policy line of our Government reaffirmed once again by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Mr. Todor Zhivkov, at the Ninth Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party in November 1966. Chairman Zhivkov stated:

"Through all its international activities the People's Republic of Bulgaria is co-operating in and contributing actively to the policy of détente in order to strengthen peace in the world and in order to strengthen mutual trust among the peoples".

(Mr. Christov, Bulgaria)

29. Prompted by these principles of the Bulgarian Government's foreign policy, my delegation believes that one of the surest and most direct means of reducing international tension and of strengthening reciprocal trust is, in point of fact, to achieve progress towards positive results in the disarmament negotiations. May I recall that the United Nations General Assembly, during its twenty-first session, showed quite clearly the importance of the disarmament problem in this regard? As is well known, these problems were well for the fore on the agenda of that session. The discussions which took place at plenary meetings of the General Assembly and in the First Committee showed once again, if there had been any need to do so, the close links of interdependence that unite international détente and the establishment of a climate of confidence with the achievement of progress in the field of disarmament.

30. That is tantamount to saying that any progress in the disarmament negotiations depends largely -- if not exclusively -- on the reduction of international tension and the establishment of that climate of confidence about which there is so much talk. However great the desire to arrive at an agreement -- either general or partial -- in the field of disarmament, it is quite obviously necessary to re-establish confidence and, to this end, to eliminate the causes which increase the tension. The Secretary-General, U Thant, states in the introduction to his Annual Report on the Work of the United Nations:

"The escalating hostilities in Viet-Nam and the deteriorating international situation have inevitably intensified the arms race in both the conventional and the nuclear fields and have no less inevitably had an adverse effect on negotiations for disarmament, above all for general and complete disarmament".

(A/6301/Add.1, p.2)

The great majority of the delegates to the twenty-first session of the General Assembly expressed the same opinion.

31. The Bulgarian delegation considers that the war of aggression now being waged by the United States in Viet-Nam is one of the most serious causes of the present tension. With the resumption of bombing and the intensification of military operations, that war is worsening the international situation to such an extent as to create an immediate threat to world peace. There is no doubt that it constitutes one of the gravest handicaps to the work of our Committee and an obstacle to the progress of the disarmament negotiations.

(Mr. Christov, Bulgaria)

32. Foremost among the questions discussed with the greatest attention in the United Nations and arousing the keenest interest in world opinion was the need and the urgency of concluding an agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. My delegation fully shares the view that this is a crucial problem because of the obvious danger which a further proliferation of nuclear weapons entails for all countries and peoples.

33. The conclusion of a non-proliferation agreement is therefore a task of primary importance and undeniable urgency. The efforts exerted to find a solution to this problem assume, furthermore, a particular importance for the future evolution of the disarmament talks. A non-proliferation treaty will mean not only that we shall have succeeded in checking the danger represented by the spread of nuclear weapons. The existence of such a treaty, we firmly believe, will also contribute to the relaxation of international tension and to the strengthening of the foundations of European security, and, because of its political and psychological repercussions, will no doubt open up new prospects of achieving progress in further negotiations on the whole of the problems connected with disarmament.

34. According to the general feeling prevailing at present, favourable conditions have been brought about which enable us to begin one of the most important and urgent tasks that have been entrusted to our Committee. In this respect the appeal contained in resolution 2149 (XXI) (ENDC/185), unanimously adopted by the United Nations General Assembly and requesting all Member States to refrain from any actions which might hamper the conclusion of an agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, makes it incumbent on our Committee to facilitate and expedite its efforts to arrive at a solution of the problem, and at the same time to oppose any activities aimed directly or indirectly at creating difficulties in this highly responsible work.

35. That is why my delegation considers it our duty, while going ahead with the study of the problems which deserve our attention, to speak out against certain deliberately obstructive activities. To be more explicit, may I say that we cannot ignore the unbridled campaign that is now being conducted in Western Germany against the conclusion of a non-proliferation treaty? There is no doubt that basically that campaign is aimed, not against any particular point of a draft treaty, but against the very principle of an effective non-proliferation treaty; it is aimed, indeed, against the efforts of this Committee in that direction.

(Mr. Christov, Bulgaria)

36. We do not intend to dwell on the different phases and aspects of that campaign, in which there is no lack of blustering statements and sensational revelations regarding the contents of an alleged draft treaty, or even direct or veiled threats. An enormous propaganda machine has been mobilized in the Federal Republic of Germany in order to attempt to prove that the real danger comes, not from proliferation of nuclear weapons, but from the treaty which would put an end to such proliferation. Paying no heed to the United Nations appeal contained in the resolution I have already mentioned, or to world public opinion and the will of the vast majority of peoples, well-known leading circles in the Federal Republic of Germany have felt able to proclaim openly their intention of torpedoing the efforts aimed at concluding a non-proliferation treaty.

37. What else does all this mean but an expression of that lust for power obsessing the leading circles of the Federal German Republic, which, despite the false pretexts under which they have tried to conceal it, are pursuing their aim of opening the way to access to atomic weapons for the Federal Republic of Germany?

38. At the same time as the United Nations General Assembly adopted the resolutions relating to the problem of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, it also adopted at its twenty-first session a number of important resolutions concerning collateral measures and the basic problem entrusted to our Committee, namely general and complete disarmament.

39. Special importance has been attached to the question of the halting and banning of underground nuclear tests. The General Assembly resolution on this point (A/RES/2163(XXI), ENDC/185) requests the Committee to elaborate without any further delay a treaty banning underground nuclear weapon tests. After all that has been said on this problem, there is no need to repeat at length that the reaching of an agreement would be a major step forward and would, on account of its political significance, have a very favourable effect on the reduction of international tension and on the further progress of our work.

40. At present the only obstacle to the solution of this long-matured problem is the insistence of the Western Powers and, first and foremost, of the United States on linking the ending of underground tests with demands for international control. Such claims, as has been sufficiently explained at previous sessions, have nothing to do with the problem and pursue other aims.

(Mr. Christov, Bulgaria)

41. We believe that, in accordance with the General Assembly resolution which stresses the importance of seismology, and bearing in mind also the actual scientific realities relating to national means of detection and verification that are available to States, the Committee has at its disposal all the necessary elements for reaching an agreement on the banning of underground nuclear tests on the basis of control carried out by national means.

42. Following a proposal by the Soviet Union, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution on the problem of the elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America (A/RES/2165(XXI); ibid.). The existence of such bases, regardless of the region or territory in which they are situated, constitutes a permanent threat to international peace and security. The history of aggression and of interference in the internal affairs of other countries testifies that foreign military bases have at all times served and continue to serve as a hotbed of threats and a starting-point for activities directed against the independence, security and peace of various countries. The elimination of these bases is therefore of paramount importance for the easing of tension and the safeguarding of peace. My delegation considers that the Eighteen-Nation Committee should once again give its full attention to this problem.

43. The idea of establishing denuclearized zones in various parts of the world has always been supported by the Bulgarian Government. Its position on this subject is clear. The establishment of such zones can help towards limiting the spread of nuclear weapons, the armaments race and the possibilities of the use of nuclear weapons, and constitutes an element of pacification and the easing of tension. We think that the statement made last Tuesday by the representative of Mexico (ENDC/PV.287) concerning the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (ENDC/186) should encourage our Committee to deal once again with this most important problem.

44. While applying our efforts to the questions I have just listed, as well as to any others which may be raised, we must not and cannot, in the opinion of my delegation, fail to give our attention to the problem of complete and general disarmament under effective international control. That is the crucial task entrusted to our Committee, the task for the solution of which it was set up. It is that task that was recalled once again in General Assembly resolution A/RES/2162 C (XXI).

(Mr. Christov, Bulgaria)

45. My delegation fully shares the view expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Roshchin, in his statement at our meeting on 21 February: that the struggle for general and complete disarmament is one of the major problems of international politics and requires persistent efforts for its solution (ENDC/PV.287, para.41). It is the search for that solution that focuses the hopes of all the peoples of the world on our Conference. We hope that the work of this session will meet those hopes, and we shall be happy if we can help to achieve that worthy aim.

46. Mr. BURNS (Canada): I will begin my statement by welcoming the new leaders of delegations in our Committee. Ambassador Christov, the representative of Bulgaria; U Kyaw Min, the representative of Burma; Ambassador Winkler, of Czechoslovakia; Ambassador Alhaji Sule Kolo, of Nigeria, and Mr. Ecobesco, now leading the Romanian delegation, whom we know well as a member of that delegation through many previous sessions. We may hope that all these new members will bring to our deliberations a new viewpoint, and perhaps the new inspiration which it has been suggested in certain other places -- and even here -- that this Committee may need.

47. We are also very happy to have Mr. Protitch with us again as Special Representative of the Secretary-General. The Secretary-General's message (ENDC/PV.287, para.4), which Mr. Protitch transmitted to us, put clearly the tasks which have been laid upon this Committee by the twenty-first session of the United Nations General Assembly.

48. What I have to communicate to the Committee today is on the subject of non-proliferation, which is the most immediate and urgent problem before us. Mr. Paul Martin, Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, has asked me to make the following statement on his behalf:

"We have welcomed the recent bilateral discussions between the United States and the Soviet Union on the treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, which we understand have brought those countries close to agreement. We look forward to the tabling shortly of that draft treaty, and to its careful study in this Committee. Like every country represented here, and indeed every responsible member of the international community, we hope we are close to reaching agreement on what can be one of the most significant international arms control measures of our generation.

"The urgency and importance of a non-proliferation treaty are clear. We are at an extremely critical point of history, when the decision of one country to join the ranks of the nuclear-weapons Powers could trigger an uncontrollable, prohibitively costly and potentially catastrophic arms race. This could be the last chance of preventing such an arms race.

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

"Since the basic purpose of a non-proliferation treaty is to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons, a treaty must provide that the control of existing nuclear weapons shall rest incontestably with the present nuclear-weapons Powers, and that States without nuclear weapons shall renounce the acquisition or development of nuclear weapons. While this is an inherently discriminatory approach to the problem, it is the only rational one. Indeed, in the short run it is in the interests of non-nuclear-weapon States to renounce nuclear weapons, and thus to eliminate the danger of nuclear warfare among themselves and to reduce the danger of smaller conflicts developing into nuclear wars into which the great Powers might be drawn. In the longer run, of course, substantial benefits would accrue to all nations if, as we intend, the treaty contributed to international stability and to an atmosphere conducive to more comprehensive measures of arms control.

"It is neither unnatural nor unreasonable that countries foregoing their option to produce nuclear weapons should wish to ensure that their act of self-denial should in turn lead the nuclear weapon Powers to undertake tangible steps to reduce and eliminate their vast stockpiles of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles. We are therefore of the opinion that nuclear-weapons States signatories to a treaty should be party to a clear and compelling declaration of intent to embark on the process of nuclear arms control. In short, we think that by means of this treaty nuclear as well as non-nuclear States should contribute, and be seen to contribute, to the objective of nuclear disarmament.

"It is of course important in this connexion to ensure that the treaty should be seen to work effectively in practice. A provision for periodic review of its terms and operation is therefore an objective to which the Canadian Government has already subscribed and one which it will continue to pursue.

"The term 'loophole' has been freely used in this Committee's deliberations on a non-proliferation treaty. In our view, a treaty permitting non-nuclear weapon States to conduct, on a national basis, nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes would contain a substantial loophole. We believe that

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

it is impossible to distinguish between the technology required in nuclear explosions for peaceful as against military purposes, and that a non-nuclear-weapon Power which detonated a nuclear explosive device, no matter for what purposes, would in effect have taken a decisive step towards the production of nuclear weapons. At the same time we believe that a treaty should contain a clear assurance that non-nuclear-weapon Powers may obtain the economic and scientific benefits of the use of peaceful nuclear explosions and, specifically, should have assurances of obtaining from nuclear weapon Powers the use of such explosive devices under the supervision of an appropriate international organization. We are pleased to note that President Johnson has said in his message to this Committee^{1/} that the United States of America is prepared to make nuclear explosive services for peaceful purposes available to non-nuclear-weapon States on a non-discriminatory basis under appropriate international safeguards.

"There has been some discussion recently of the value of technological 'spin-off' from nuclear explosions. We are not convinced that such 'spin-off' is significant, but we note again that President Johnson has assured us that not only peaceful explosive services but also any technological 'spin-off' from them will be available to non-nuclear-weapon States. It goes without saying, of course, that a non-proliferation treaty should not place any inhibitions whatever on research or development of advanced peaceful nuclear technology.

"It is in our view important that a non-proliferation treaty should include an effective safeguard clause, the main purpose of which would be to ensure that the treaty provisions are being observed and that nuclear fuel designated for peaceful purposes is not diverted clandestinely to the manufacture of nuclear weapons. Moreover, it will be important to establish the principle that the treaty safeguards system, to be internationally administered, must be acceptable to the great majority of States which are expected to sign the treaty.

^{1/} ENDC/187

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

"I have touched in a very general way on some of the most important issues that we will be examining in the weeks ahead. We propose to present our views in a more comprehensive manner once we have a draft text before us.

"In conclusion, I should like to make some brief remarks on the signing in Mexico City earlier this month of a Treaty to denuclearize Latin America and the Caribbean.^{1/} This is a development which we in Canada have warmly welcomed. We extend our congratulations to our Latin-American and Caribbean friends - and I would mention the contribution of our Mexican colleague, Ambassador Garcia Robles, in particular - noting that theirs is a unique achievement which establishes an important precedent. The signing of this Treaty is eloquent testimony to the tireless efforts of our neighbours, who have taken steps toward excluding nuclear weapons from their area and toward ensuring that nuclear energy is used exclusively for peaceful purposes. Let us hope that this achievement will lend impetus to our efforts here to reach agreement on a universal non-proliferation treaty."

49. Before closing I should like, on behalf of the Canadian delegation, to add something with regard to the Latin-American nuclear-free zone treaty. We know that this agreement has not been attained without difficulty; and we all are aware of how greatly Mr. Robles's determination, persistence and diplomatic skill have contributed to the happy result. The Canadian delegation offers its sincere congratulations. We should also, while on this subject, record our appreciation of the contribution Mr. Epstein has made to this achievement, as was attested by the resolution of the preliminary conference. Mr. Epstein has not only been helping us in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee since we began our work; he has been with the United Nations Secretariat dealing with disarmament since the Organization took hold of that activity. He has managed to keep his optimism, his energy and his enthusiasm for the cause through years of discouragement; and some of us wonder what his secret is.

50. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland): Before proceeding to make my statement, I should like to join with my colleagues who preceded me in this debate in welcoming to our midst the newly-appointed representatives of Bulgaria, Burma, Czechoslovakia, Mexico, Nigeria and Romania, and to wish them success in our common endeavours.

51. When we adjourned about six months ago the report we were submitting to the General Assembly (ENDC/184) was unfortunately a negative one; and our failure to register progress on the road towards disarmament, viewed against the background of the mounting international crisis caused by the American aggression in Viet-Nam left us very little hope for the future prospects of our Committee. True enough the war in Viet-Nam, waged with ever-increasing brutality by the United States, still casts its heavy shadow over the international scene. But it is becoming increasingly evident that the use of force cannot produce the results the United States Government is expecting.

52. Certainly this Committee is not the forum to settle the Viet-Nam conflict. But this body, whose very aim is to bring about a warless world, cannot ignore acts of aggression and warfare, which are incompatible with the very objective for which it has been created. To ignore those acts would be contrary to the spirit of the United Nations General Assembly's resolution, adopted at its last session, on the prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations (A/RES/2160 (XXI)), as well as to the resolution on the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty (A/RES/2225 (XXI)).

53. An objective analysis of recent events would also reveal some bright spots on the otherwise bleak international scene. In particular, we have been witnessing lively high-level political contacts between European nations belonging to different political and social systems; and I believe that they reflect the growing desire to level off the barriers which are still dividing Europe. They reflect the striving to establish conditions of safety for all, and to normalize the relations between States on the basis of equality, respect for sovereign rights and territorial integrity. May I add parenthetically that Poland has not been inactive in the promotion of peaceful coexistence and co-operation in Europe? At this juncture, however, I shall not take up the Committee's time by describing the various initiatives my Government has taken and the proposals it has advanced in the interest of all-European security.

(Mr. Blusztajn, Poland)

54. Admittedly, the removal of mistrust, suspicion, fear and antagonisms in Europe could proceed at a much faster pace, and the thread of mutual understanding we have succeeded in establishing with a number of countries could be translated into more comprehensive agreements in the interest of European and world peace and security, were it not for the policies of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, which still pursues its territorial claims, seeks to acquire weapons of mass destruction, and refuses to recognize the realities of the Europe of 1967. Some tactical moves which were recently made by that Government, and which may look like gestures of good will are not only insufficient; they are thoroughly misleading. For nothing short of a radical change of the policies hitherto pursued by the Federal Republic of Germany will do.

55. Last month the Treaty governing the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, was signed in Moscow, Washington and London (A/RES/2222 (XXI)). It is unquestionably an important landmark on the road of the peaceful conquest of the universe through co-operative efforts of mankind. Seen from the angle of disarmament, the Treaty constitutes a significant measure preventing the arms race from reaching the vast expanses of space. Thus, for the first time in the field of arms, foresight has triumphed over narrow, ephemeral, short-lived interests.

56. A similar amount of clairvoyance was shown by the countries which a few days ago concluded the Treaty for the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America (ENDC/186). It is a matter of deep satisfaction to us that the idea of setting up zones free from weapons of mass destruction, advanced some nine years ago by the Polish Foreign Minister (ENDC/C.1/1; PV.189, p.6), has been brought to fruition at least in one part of our troubled globe. We sincerely congratulate the Mexican Government, and specifically Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles, on this accomplishment. It encourages us to pursue our plan for the denuclearization of Central Europe.

57. Hopeful signs have also appeared with regard to the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Long years of talks, both within this Committee and elsewhere, have proved not to be useless or unproductive. As a result, the main hurdles blocking the way to the treaty have been lowered, if not eliminated altogether. Some problems still remain; but given good will they can, we believe, be solved to the satisfaction of all concerned.

(Mr. Blusztajn, Poland)

53. The threat to the treaty does not lie in the differences over certain detailed provisions. It is the opposition to the very idea of non-proliferation -- coming, as it does, from familiar quarters -- which may place the treaty in jeopardy. True enough, the opposition to non-proliferation is seldom expressed in unambiguous terms. A frontal attack in defiance of world public opinion would naturally be too compromising. Thus, for instance, it is being alledged that a ban on the spread of nuclear weapons would discriminate against the non-nuclear countries. But surely the essence of a non-proliferation treaty is to freeze the present state of affairs with regard to the ownership and control of nuclear weapons, so as to facilitate moves towards the reduction of stockpiles and their eventual elimination.

59. This is by no means a new approach. Ever since the concept of non-proliferation was put forward, it has implied obligations on the part of nuclear Powers not to transfer nuclear weapons, and on the part of non-nuclear Powers not to acquire them. I leave aside the question of whether the possession of nuclear weapons really constitutes an advantage, as some think. But the raising of the problem now, at this late stage of our negotiations on the treaty, can be motivated solely by a desire to destroy the chances of achieving such a treaty. That is exactly what is being done by a number of statesmen and politicians in the Federal Republic of Germany.

60. It is also being asserted that a non-proliferation treaty might endanger the security of non-nuclear States. The fallacy of that argument hardly needs to be proved. No State can be immune from a devastating attack unless we destroy all nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them. In any event the possession of nuclear weapons, in our opinion, provides no guarantee in this respect. If anything it increases the danger to the possessor; for in a nuclear war nuclear installations would be the prime targets for a strike. Short of complete disarmament, and short of the absolute prohibition of nuclear weapons, a greater feeling of security could none the less be engendered in the non-nuclear countries if the nuclear Powers solemnly pledged not to use nuclear weapons against the States which have no such weapons stationed on their territories. Denuclearization, then, is the answer to the dilemma, not multiplication of nuclear Powers.

61. Is it not clear that if nuclear weapons spread to one nation or to many, especially in Europe, the risks of nuclear war will increase and the security of any individual country, of the whole area and of the world in general will decrease?

(Mr. Blusztajn, Poland)

Apparently this truth is not recognized by those in the Federal Republic of Germany who spare no fervour in discrediting the idea of non-proliferation, so strong is their idée fixe that West Germany should acquire nuclear-Power status -- evidently not for defence purposes.

62. Yet another objection to the treaty has been raised. Some contend that a prohibition of the use of nuclear energy for military purposes might impair civil atomic projects. Outright distortions have been resorted to in drawing a sombre picture of Germany slipping into industrial backwardness as a result of commitments not to manufacture nuclear weapons. In fact the technology involved in developing nuclear weaponry is of very limited value, if any, for civil purposes or for advancing the nation's economic strength. The point was made crystal-clear in the eloquent statement by Lord Chalfont at the meeting on 23 February (ENDC/PV.288, paras. 15 et seq.) and I have nothing to add to what he had to say on the subject.

63. The list of complaints against the treaty voiced in a violent campaign bordering on hysteria in the Federal Republic of Germany is much longer. I have dealt with some of them just to illustrate their true nature as mere alibis and excuses for blocking the agreement; and may I add that no State has shown more disregard for the United Nations urgent appeal to renounce actions hampering the conclusion of an agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons (A/RES/2149 (XXI))?

64. The Polish delegation does not, of course, dismiss certain legitimate pre-occupations of the non-aligned States, especially those concerning the relationship of a non-proliferation treaty to other measures of disarmament. It does consider that a non-proliferation treaty cannot and should not supersede our obligation to carry into effect ever new and ever more comprehensive measures of disarmament. The parties to the treaty will have to undertake a firm commitment vigorously to continue the search for such measures. For, as was pointed out in the resolution of the General Assembly adopted on 19 November 1965, a treaty preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons "should be a step towards the achievement of general and complete disarmament and, more particularly, nuclear disarmament." (A/RES/2028 (XX), ENDC/161).

65. There are a number of items on the Committee's agenda, some of them specifically referred to it by the General Assembly (ENDC/185). I have in mind, among others, the question of strict observance of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 prohibiting the use of

(Mr. Blusztajn, Poland)

chemical and bacteriological weapons, the cessation of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests in all environments, and the elimination of foreign military bases. We hope that they will be discussed in the Committee in due time.

66. Nor should we slacken our efforts towards achieving substantial progress in reaching agreement on the question of general and complete disarmament. We trust that the report which the Secretary-General of the United Nations was asked by the General Assembly to prepare "on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons and on the security and economic implications for States of the acquisition and further development of these weapons", (A/RES/2162 A (XXI)) will prove useful in this respect. However, the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons must be given high priority in accordance with the mandate contained in General Assembly resolutions 2028 (XX) and 2153 (XXI) (ENDC/185). The treaty is within our reach. We have come to a point where further delay may endanger the outcome of our negotiations.

67. We in Poland are naturally and primarily interested in the European aspect of the non-proliferation issue. For some time we have been studying ways and means of consolidating the efficacy of the treaty after its conclusion. In this context we have been thinking of regional measures which would constitute a logical outgrowth of the non-proliferation treaty; and we have already discussed them in a preliminary way with some countries, both in the East and in the West. They are meant to be in full harmony with the basic aim of non-proliferation, which is to contain and circumscribe the nuclear threat.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 289th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of H.E. Mr. William C. Foster, representative of the United States.

"Statements were made by the representatives of Italy, Bulgaria, Canada and Poland.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 2 March 1967, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.

